



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|-------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/609,186 | 06/26/2003 | Cezary Marcjan | MS301534.01/MSFTP685US | 7627 |
| 27195 | 7590 | 11/26/2008 | | |
| AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP | | | EXAMINER | |
| 127 Public Square | | | MURRAY, DANIEL C | |
| 57th Floor, Key Tower | | | | |
| CLEVELAND, OH 44114 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2443 | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 11/26/2008 | ELECTRONIC |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

doctet1@thepatentattorneys.com
hholmes@thepatentattorneys.com
lpasterchek@thepatentattorneys.com

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

10/609,186

Applicant(s)

MARCJAN, CEZARY

Examiner

DANIEL C. MURRAY

Art Unit

2443

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443

Continuation of 11. Note: Applicant's arguments filed 12NOV2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Furthermore, the majority of these arguments have already have been responded to in the Final Action mailed on 03OCT2008

Applicant argues that Kenyon et al. discloses "...when an overlay is shared/transferred between computer spaces, it implies that the documents and associations contained in the overlay are also transferred from one computer space to the other."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees Kenyon et al. clearly discloses that information is not replicated by the overlay (column 4 lines 6-10).

Applicant argues that "...the claimed subject matter relates to transferring/sharing only computer objects but not object associations between computer spaces. Thus, when an object is transferred between computer spaces associations between a shared object and other objects already existing in a new space into which the shared object is transferred are automatically formed."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees; The Examiner fails to see how the associations are to be automatically formed in the second computer space when only the object itself is transferred from the first computer space to the second computer space without transferring the object associations with the object. The transfer of association information would be required in order to enable the claimed invention to function. Furthermore, the feature of transferring/sharing only the computer objects but not object associations between the computer space is not reflected in the claims. Applicant is clearly claiming that object associations are shared between computer spaces "automatically sharing from the first computer space with the second computer space the one or more associations in the first computer space between the selected object and the first objects in the second computer space." (claim 1, among others).

Furthermore, Applicant's invention is entitled "Sharing Computer Objects with Associations" which implies sharing the computer objects and their associations, in addition, the specification clearly indicates that such association information is shared (abstract, paragraph [0005], [0006], [0007], among others).